



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/668,785	09/22/2000	James Longbottom	WEAT/0042	2355
36735	7590	01/19/2006	EXAMINER	
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P. 3040 POST OAK BOULEVARD, SUITE 1500 HOUSTON, TX 77056			FRENEL, VANEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3626	

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/668,785

Applicant(s)

LONGBOTTOM ET AL.

Examiner

Vanel Frenel

Art Unit

3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45, 47, 49-53 and 55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45, 47, 49-53 and 55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to the Amendment filed on 08/24/05. Claims 1, 27, 30, 42, 45, 47, 49-53 and 55 have been amended. Claims 46, 48, 54 and 56-68 have been canceled. Claims 1-45, 47, 49-53 and 55 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 27, 30, 42, 45, 47, 49-53 and 55 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman (5,504,491), Tubel et al (5,730,291), Yamazaki et al (6,867,752) in view of Millheim (4,794,534).

(A) Claim 1 has been amended to recite the limitation of "a drilling rig", securing", "data", "person", "drilling rig", "and", "drilling", "drilling rig" and "data".

However, these limitations have shown in Millheim. In particular, Millheim suggests "a drilling rig", securing", "data", "person", "drilling rig", "and", "drilling", "drilling rig" and "data" (See Millheim, Col.6, lines 1-51; Col.8, lines 10-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Millheim within the collective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki with the motivation of improving simulation i.e., decision

enhancement, tool, which has been developed. By providing drilling data on a real-time basis to the engineering simulator, future actions at the well can be simulated immediately if necessary (See Millheim, Col.3, lines 17-24).

(B) Claims 27 and 42 have been amended to recite the limitation of "an external camera". However, this limitation is clearly taught by Millheim (See Millheim, Col.7, lines 49-68 to Col.8, line 28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Millheim within the collective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki with the motivation of improving simulation i.e., decision enhancement, tool, which has been developed. By providing drilling data on a real-time basis to the engineering simulator, future actions at the well can be simulated immediately if necessary (See Millheim, Col.3, lines 17-24).

(C) Claim 30 has been amended to recite the limitation of "securable". However, this change does not change the scope and the breadth of the claim, and is therefore rejected for the reason given in the previous Office Action, and incorporated herein.

(D) Claim 45 has been amended to recite the limitation of "the method of claim 42, further comprising". However, this change does not change the scope and the breadth

Art Unit: 3626

of the claim, and is therefore rejected for the reason given in the previous Office Action, and incorporated herein.

(E) Claim 47 has been amended to recite the limitations of "device", "device", "wide area network" and "wide area network". However, this limitation has been met by Millheim in Fig.7 with the used of a satellite modem 50 which allows the distribution of a two-way communication to take place (See Millheim, Col.9, lines 1-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Millheim within the collective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki with the motivation of improving simulation i.e., decision enhancement, tool, which has been developed. By providing drilling data on a real-time basis to the engineering simulator, future actions at the well can be simulated immediately if necessary (See Millheim, Col.3, lines 17-24).

(F) Claim 49 has been amended to recite the limitation of "wide area network". However, this limitation has been met by Millheim in Fig.7 with the used of a satellite modem 50 which allows the distribution of a two-way communication to take place (See Millheim, Col.9, lines 1-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Millheim within the collective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki with the motivation of improving simulation i.e., decision enhancement, tool, which has been developed. By providing drilling data on a real-time

basis to the engineering simulator, future actions at the well can be simulated immediately if necessary (See Millheim, Col.3, lines 17-24).

(G) Claim 50 has been amended to recite the limitations of "device", "a well-site", "device", "well-site", "via a wide area network", "well-site", "the well -site" and "the well-site".

However, this limitation has been met by Millheim in Fig.7 with the used of a satellite modem 50 which allows the distribution of a two-way communication to take place (See Millheim, Col.9, lines 1-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Millheim within the collective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki with the motivation of improving simulation i.e., decision enhancement, tool, which has been developed. By providing drilling data on a real-time basis to the engineering simulator, future actions at the well can be simulated immediately if necessary (See Millheim, Col.3, lines 17-24).

(H) Claims 51 and 52 have been amended to recite the limitation of "well-site" (See Millheim, Col.7, lines 49-68 to Col.8, line 27).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel, Yamazaki and Millheim are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1, 27, 42, 45, 47, 50 and 55, and incorporated herein.

Art Unit: 3626

(I) Claim 53 has been amended to recite the limitation of "well-site activity" (See Millheim, Col.7, lines 49-68 to Col.8, line 27).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel, Yamazaki and Millheim are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1, 27, 42, 45, 47, 50 and 55, and incorporated herein.

(J) Claim 55 has been amended to recite the limitation of "the method of claim 42, further comprising" and "device". However, this change does not change the scope and the breadth of the claim, and is therefore rejected for the reason given in the previous Office Action, and incorporated herein.

(K) Claims 2-26, 28-29, 31-41 and 43-44 have not been amended are therefore rejected for the same reasons given in the previous Office Action, and incorporated herein.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 08/24/05 with respect to claims 1, 27, 30, 42, 45, 47, 49-53 and 55 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited but not the applied art teaches well protection apparatus and method (5, 154,233), company deals in communication Alaska telecom

makes sure the word gets out to remote areas; [Final Edition] by Patti Epler Daily News business reporter. Anchorage Daily News. Anchorage, Alaska: Jul.20, 1986; pg.J.1 and Telco Strikes Oil in Ocean Depth by (Cochrane, Anne. Telephone Engineer & Management. Duluth: Aug 15, 1982. Vol.86, Iss.16; pg. 90, 3 pgs).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vanel Frenel whose telephone number is 571-272-6769. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 571-272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

V.F
V.F

November 8, 2005


JOSEPH THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER